

**Agenda Item:** 7.3 (WG T2)

**Source:** NTT DoCoMo

**Title:** Comment on MExE Stage 2 (23.057, ver.2.0.0 [TP-99242])

**Document for:** Discussion

---

This document expresses some comments on Mobile Station Application Execution Environment (MExE) Stage 2 (described in TS23.057, ver.2.0.0 [1]), and how it should be defined as a UMTS standard within TSG-T2/WSG1.

*On MExE implementation*

In order to ensure further development of MExE in the future, it is important to consider the following aspects:

(1) a flexible specification taking into account service and implementation

(2) a specification that will allow for easy accommodation of developments in IT (Information Technologies) expected in the future.

As already reported, there was a very heated debate on the definition of MExE classmarks in the previous T2/SWG1 meeting in Ystad. The discussion centered around the fact that according to the current classmark definitions, Classmark 1 is WAP and Classmark 2 is P-Java + WML browser and WML script; which means that according to the specifications that exist today, the support of WAP is mandatory within MExE. There were opinions raised about a possible modification of the specification in order to include an additional classmark not supporting the WAP function.

In this discussion, opinions were split making it impossible to reach any agreement on the modification of the specification; and Release 99 at this point has remained unchanged.

But it should be noted that regarding the current classmark definition within SWG1, there are differences in opinions, and that no consensus has so far been reached.

TP-99242 (the report on R99 MExE Stage 2 (TS23.057)) states that "There are no contentious issues." However, the classmark issue remains "a contentious issue" in the sense that no consensus has so far been reached in this area. And the report needs to be modified to say that in fact no consensus has been reached in the discussions so far.

In addition, continued discussions are necessary regarding this issue when we start discussions about R00. Furthermore in the discussions related to the creation of additional classmarks in MExE to take place when new technology (e.g. K-Java) become available in the future, the starting point of the discussion should not be the WAP mandatory issue.